

INITIAL CONDITIONS AND UNITARITY IN UNIMODULAR QUANTUM COSMOLOGY

ALAN DAUGHTON, JORMA LOUKO AND RAFAEL D. SORKIN

*Department of Physics, Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244-1130, USA*

Abstract

We consider quantization of the positive curvature Friedmann cosmology in the unimodular modification of Einstein's theory, in which the spacetime four-volume appears as an explicit time variable. The Hamiltonian admits self-adjoint extensions that give unitary evolution in the Hilbert space associated with the Schrödinger equation. The semiclassical estimate to the no-boundary wave function of Hartle and Hawking is found. If this estimate is accurate, there is a continuous flux of probability into the configuration space from vanishing three-volume, and the no-boundary wave function evolves nonunitarily. Generalizations of these results hold in a class of anisotropic cosmologies.

In formulating the gravitational functional integral $\int \mathcal{D}g \exp [iS(g)]$, one may choose to limit the geometries g which enter the sum by specifying—in addition to any boundary conditions which may be imposed on g —a fixed value T for the total four-volume: $\int \sqrt{-g} d^4x = T$. This produces a theory¹⁻⁸ whose classical limit is equivalent to the Einstein theory except that the cosmological constant becomes a constant of integration, rather than a dynamically unalterable parameter in the Lagrangian. Limiting g in this way (which is particularly natural in the context of causal set theory) not only tends to ameliorate the convergence difficulties of the functional integral, but it does away with the “frozen” character of the wave function Ψ , replacing one of the Hamiltonian constraint equations with a Schrödinger equation for the *evolution* of Ψ with T . (In addition to its technical ramifications, this “unfreezing” helps in making physical sense of questions like whether quantum effects circumvent the singularities of gravitational collapse.)

In both the sum-over-histories interpretation of this “unimodular” theory¹ (in which the history itself is the primary object) and the Hilbert space interpretation²⁻⁴ (in which the wave function is the primary object) it is important

Talk given at the 5th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, May 1993.

to ask whether Ψ evolves unitarily with T . In this contribution we shall study the wave function derived from the no-boundary proposal of Hartle and Hawking,^{9–11} whose aim is in effect to specify initial boundary conditions on g . Specifically, we ask: does the no-boundary prescription give a wave function which evolves unitarily in the Hilbert space of the unimodular theory?

Recall first that the no-boundary proposal of Hartle and Hawking is a topological statement about the manifolds that are taken to contribute to the path integral in terms of which the wave function is defined. In conventional Einstein gravity one writes¹²

$$\Psi_{\text{NB}}(h_{ij}; \Sigma) = \int \mathcal{D}g_{\mu\nu} \exp[-I(g_{\mu\nu}; M)] \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $I(g_{\mu\nu}; M)$ is the Euclidean action of the gravitational field $g_{\mu\nu}$ on the four-manifold M . The four-manifold M is compact with a boundary, such that its boundary is the three-surface Σ which appears in the argument of the wave function. The integral is over metrics $g_{\mu\nu}$ on M which induce the metric h_{ij} on Σ . To give a meaning to this formal expression, additional input is needed; see for example Refs.^{12,13}

To apply these ideas in unimodular gravity, we take the unimodular no-boundary wave function to be given by

$$\Psi_{\text{NB}}(h_{ij}; \Sigma; T) = \int \mathcal{D}g_{\mu\nu} \exp[iS(g_{\mu\nu}; M)] \quad , \quad (2)$$

where M and Σ are as above, and S is the Lorentzian action. The conditions for the metrics $g_{\mu\nu}$ are that they induce the metric h_{ij} on Σ , and that the total Lorentzian four-volume is equal to T . Note that, even apart from issues of convergence, the explicit appearance of the *Lorentzian* four-volume in the conditions for $g_{\mu\nu}$ implies that the integral (2) can in no sense be thought of as an integral over Euclidean (i.e., positive definite) metrics.

As an example we consider the positive curvature Friedmann model. The metric is

$$ds^2 = \sigma^2 [-N^2(t)dt^2 + a^2(t)d\Omega_3^2] \quad , \quad (3)$$

where $d\Omega_3^2$ is the metric on the unit three-sphere, $\sigma^2 = 2G/3\pi$, and G is Newton's constant. We take $a > 0$. The action of the unimodular theory for this metric is obtained by inserting the metric into the Einstein action and setting $N = 1/(a^3)$, with the result

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \left(-a^4 \dot{a}^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} \right) dt \quad . \quad (4)$$

The Lorentzian solutions obtained by varying (4) are the one-parameter family of de Sitter spaces, written in the proper-time gauge as

$$ds^2 = \sigma^2 \left[-d\tau^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \cosh^2(\sqrt{\lambda}\tau) d\Omega_3^2 \right] \quad , \quad (5)$$

where the integration constant $\lambda > 0$ is related to the conventional cosmological constant Λ by $\lambda = \sigma^2 \Lambda / 3$.

The quantum Hamiltonian operator is

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \right) \left(\frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \right) - \frac{1}{a^2} \right] \quad (6)$$

where we have chosen the standard “covariant” factor ordering. The quantity T in the general formalism outlined above is now simply replaced by t , and the t -evolution of ψ is given by the Schrödinger equation $\hat{H}\psi = i\partial\psi/\partial t$.

The Hamiltonian (6) is clearly Hermitian in the corresponding inner product

$$(\chi, \psi) = \int_0^\infty a^2 da \bar{\chi} \psi \quad (7)$$

For the Schrödinger evolution to be unitary, one needs a Hamiltonian which is not only Hermitian but self-adjoint.¹⁴ It is straightforward to show that our Hamiltonian has a one-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions, the defining domain of each extension being functions satisfying the boundary condition

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \left(\alpha \psi + \frac{\beta}{a^2} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a} \right) = 0 \quad (8)$$

for given real numbers α, β . The situation is very much like for the free particle on the half-line, as can be seen by going¹ to the natural “position” coordinate $x = a^3$; the potential term in the Hamiltonian is singular as $x \rightarrow 0$, but this singularity is so weak that it does not essentially affect the self-adjointness analysis.

Thus, with the one-parameter family of different self-adjoint extensions of the Hamiltonian, we obtain a one-parameter family of distinct quantum theories. In each of these theories the Schrödinger equation gives unitary dynamics in the Hilbert space determined by the inner product (7).

We now turn to the no-boundary wave function. Following Hartle and Hawking,¹⁰ we take the four-manifold to be the closed four-dimensional ball $\bar{B}^4$. The semiclassical estimate to the path integral is

$$\Psi_{\text{NB}}(a, t) \sim P \exp [iS_c(a, t)] \quad (9)$$

where P is assumed to be slowly varying compared with the exponential factor, and $S_c(a, t)$ is the action of the classical solution with the appropriate boundary data. The classical solution is straightforward to find: it is a globally regular, genuinely complex metric, satisfying the Einstein equations with a complex-valued

cosmological constant, but having by construction a real Lorentzian four-volume. The action is given by

$$S_c(a, t) = \frac{ia^2}{6} \left\{ 5 - \frac{2 [1 + (12it/a^4)]}{\sqrt{1 + (12it/a^4)} - 1} \right\} . \quad (10)$$

The ambiguity in choosing the sign of $\sqrt{-g}$ for a complex-valued metric¹² induces an ambiguity in the imaginary part of $S_c(a, t)$. In (10), we have fixed this ambiguity by the requirement that the path integral give a well-defined vacuum state for the quantum field theory of scalar field perturbations on the gravitational background. For a discussion of this issue in conventional Einstein theory, see Refs.^{12,13}

Consider first a semiclassical interpretation of the result (10).¹² For $a^4 \ll t$, S_c is genuinely complex, and Ψ_{NB} does not correspond to classical Lorentzian spacetimes. For $a^4 \gg t$, on the other hand, S_c is almost real and Ψ_{NB} is rapidly oscillating. Integrating the equation $p = (\partial S_c / \partial a)$ in this domain gives a family of approximately Lorentzian spacetimes in which t is proportional to a^3 , and which can be seen to coincide approximately with the exact Lorentzian solution (5). All these Lorentzian spacetimes can be thought of as describing four-geometries which evolve classically after they pass through the region $a^4 \approx t$.

Consider then the compatibility of Ψ_{NB} with unitary evolution. One might expect this question to be difficult on the grounds that we do not have at hand an exact wave function but only a semiclassical estimate. However, if the estimate (9) is accurate in the sense that the prefactor P is a slowly varying function of a and t compared with the exponential factor, it is easy to see that Ψ_{NB} cannot evolve unitarily according to any of the self-adjoint extensions of $\hat{H}$. The reason is that for $t \rightarrow \infty$, (9) gives uniformly in any finite interval in a the estimate $\Psi_{\text{NB}}(a, t) \sim \exp(\sqrt{4it/3})$, which grows exponentially in $\sqrt{t}$. Therefore, if the norm (7) of Ψ_{NB} is finite, it cannot be conserved in time, and the evolution of Ψ_{NB} must be nonunitary.

The interpretation of this failure of unitarity is seen by noticing that the probability current associated with Ψ_{NB} is always towards increasing a . This means that the exponentially increasing probability is generated by injecting into the configuration space a continuously increasing probability flux from the boundary $a = 0$. In particular, the self-adjointness boundary conditions (8) must be violated. If the probability flux were directed *outward* through $a = 0$, the natural interpretation would be in terms of recollapse and disappearance of the universe. As it is, one might refer to a “continuous creation of universes from nothing.” It is intriguing that this effect appears to be rather similar to the ideas of Linde¹⁵ and Vilenkin^{16,17} for specifying a wave function in conventional Einstein gravity. [If taken literally, this continuous creation would seem to imply a “second quantization of universes”, but perhaps a more appropriate image would be of a single connected structure in which multiple spacetimes emerge (with increasing rapidity but decreasing overall

rate of growth) from a single “root”, such as an initial, non-manifold region of a causal set.]

Generalizations of this work to a family of spatially homogeneous anisotropic cosmologies will be presented elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank John Friedman for discussions. This work was supported in part by the NSF grants PHY90-05790 and PHY90-16733, and by research funds provided by Syracuse University.

References

1. R. D. Sorkin, talk given at the conference “History of Modern Gauge Theories,” held at Logan, Utah, July 1987, to appear in *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* (1993).
2. W. G. Unruh, *Phys. Rev.* **D40** (1989) 1048.
3. W. G. Unruh and R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev.* **D40** (1989) 2598.
4. M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Phys. Lett.* **222B** (1989) 195.
5. J. D. Brown and J. W. York, *Phys. Rev.* **D40** (1989) 3312.
6. R. D. Sorkin, in: *Einstein Studies II*, edited by A. Ashtekar and J. Stachel (Birkhauser, Boston, 1991).
7. L. Bombelli, in: *Gravitation — A Banff Summer Institute*, edited by R. Mann and P. Wesson (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).
8. K. V. Kuchař, *Phys. Rev.* **D43** (1991) 3332.
9. S. W. Hawking, in: *Astrophysical Cosmology: Proceedings of the Study Week on Cosmology and Fundamental Physics*, edited by H. A. Brück, G. V. Coyne and M. S. Longair (Pontificiae Academiae Scientiarum Scripta Varia, Vatican City, 1982).
10. J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 2960.
11. S. W. Hawking, *Nucl. Phys.* **B239** (1984) 257.
12. J. J. Halliwell and J. B. Hartle, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 1815.
13. J. J. Halliwell and J. Louko, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 3997.
14. M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics* (Academic, New York, 1980).
15. A. Linde, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **87** (1984) 369 [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **60** (1984) 211]; *Nuovo Cim.* **39** (1984) 401; *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **47** (1984) 925.
16. A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D30** (1984) 509.
17. A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D33** (1986) 3560; *Phys. Rev.* **D37** (1988) 888.